

# **MINUTES**

## **Asphalt Warranty Core Group (AWCG) Meeting**

Tuesday, October 2002: 8:30 AM to 3:30 PM

Conference Room

State Materials Research Park

Gainesville, Florida

\* \* \* \* \*

### ATTENDANCE:

Ron McNamara	State Pavement Evaluation Office
Charles Holzschuher	State Pavement Evaluation Office
Bruce Dietrich	State Pavement Design Office
Gale Page	State Materials Office
Jim Musselman	State Materials Office
Tom Byron	State Materials Office
Ron Meade	District V Materials Office
David Wang	State Construction Office
Greg Schiess	Federal Highway Administration
Bill Whitehurst	VEW & Sons Inc.
Jim Warren	ACAF

David Wang opened the meeting at approximately 8:45 A.M. with self-introductions by all the attendees. He also requested that everyone sign-in on the attendance sheet.

First, David explained to all the attendees that Greg Xanders had invited the Asphalt Warranty Core Group (AWCG) members from FDOT and FHWA to convene a meeting to discuss the expansion of the Contractor Guaranteed Asphalt Pavement (CGAP) specification in order to cover more projects and to pre-determine the target dates of various future activities. He hoped that this smaller group could draft a feasible solution between FDOT and FHWA and present the preliminary agreement before the industry members during the regular AWCG meeting on October 1, 2002, for their review. This way, the discussion process and time can then be visibly reduced.

This initial meeting was held on September 16, 2002, with Ananth Prasad, Bruce Dietrich, Gale Page, Ron McNamara, Tom Byron and Greg Schiess in attendance. During that meeting, it was decided that the direction with which the Department should follow for future development of the HMA program should be outlined first. Then the summary of the meeting will be presented to Freddie Simmons for his approval. This way, the AWCG can at least focus their efforts on those pre-determined directions and eliminate the confusion and misunderstanding between top management and the AWCG members. David also shared the brief email response from Freddie Simmons that "It sounds okay to me. Need to make sure we get industry buy-in....". The summary of the initial meeting is as follows:

In preparation for the October 1st Asphalt Warranty Task Team Meeting, key members of the Team met on September 16 and came up with a short-term plan and a long-term plan. The short-term plan has two components. The first is the expansion of the existing CGAP specification to other projects in order to

collect cost information from the bids. The specific project characteristics will be worked out at the Task Team Meeting. During the meeting this week, however, the group was comfortable with allowing CGAP to be used on new construction projects and resurfacing projects where sufficient HMA is placed to eliminate the industry's concern that a possible failure is due to the underlying layers. This will give the Districts several options and not be confined to the Interstate and high volume facilities. The specification can be made available before December, 2002.

The second short-term component is to add a materials and workmanship guarantee on all projects built with the July 2002 version of the HMA specification (QC 2000 specification). Unlike the present CGAP specification that eliminated the Department's verification sampling and testing completely, the proposed materials and workmanship guarantee will be an additional requirement without any modification to the July 2002 version of the specification.

The materials and workmanship guarantee will be developed to require the Contractor to repair those defects that are obviously due to their means and methods of construction. The specification will have a table with distress types, threshold criteria and remedial work similar to the CGAP specification with modifications to take into consideration the 2-3 year guarantee period and the types of projects covered by the specification. More importantly, it will also have the same provisions for suspension as CGAP presently incorporates. The group also believes this could be made available before December, 2002.

The long-term plan is to refine the CGAP specification with an ultimate goal of eliminating the majority, if not all, of the prescriptive requirements covering mix design and sampling and testing, etc., and substantially increasing the guarantee period to 15 or 20 years. A part of this effort will of course include a cost analysis of the present CGAP projects. Also included in the long-term plan is the refinement of the July 2002 version of the HMA specification taking into consideration that a materials and workmanship guarantee will be required across the board. Although not determined at this time, those refinements could include reduce sampling and testing by the Department and the Industry.

In addition to the above the group is also convinced that the Department should establish a single Dispute Review Board specifically developed for HMA warranty project. The Board's makeup would maintain uniformity of application and provide assurance to the industry of fair judgments.

The AWCG members then reviewed the above proposal of the initial meeting and after several discussions, it was concluded that the industry representatives are not interested in the Long-Term Plan because there are a lot of unknown factors involved which are beyond our control. Finally, the attendees agreed to categorize the tasks of Short-Term Plan as follows:

- 1) Expansion of the existing CGAP Specifications to some other projects in order to collect cost data from the bids and construction information from these new pilot projects.
- 2) Review the existing CGAP Specifications to make the necessary amendments to comply with the requirements of item (1) above.
- 3) Develop the Materials and Workmanship Guaranteed Specifications to require the Contractor to guarantee that the asphalt pavement will be free from defects in materials and workmanship for three (3) years.
- 4) Develop the guidelines for the FDOT jobsite people to use for the CGAP specification implementation such as the project inspection issues, quantity assurance, etc.

With respect to Task item (1), the agreed pilot project selection criteria are as follows:

- ?? Letting after December 2002
- ?? No concrete overlays
- ?? Interstate or "Interstate-like" roadways
- ?? Minimum 2" structure overlay with milling
- ?? Minimum project length of one (1) mile
- ?? No Lump Sum
- ?? Fairly short duration, if possible, of less than one year

Bruce Dietrich then provided the list of Interstate Resurfacing Projects proposed for letting in the Year of 2003, which is enclosed as Attachment 1. Based on the above-listed project selection criteria, it was decided that the following five (5) projects were selected as candidates for the next pilot projects:

DIST.	FIN. I.D. NO.	COUNTY	LOCATION	LETTING	PROJECT LENGTH
1	201263-25201	Sarasota	I-75	07/30/03	14.775 Miles
2	213261-15201	Duval	I-295	08/27/03	5.909 Miles
2	213084-25201	Columbia	I-75	09/24/03	7.703 Miles
4	231727-15201	Broward	I-95/SR-9	08/27/03	13.661 Miles
4	231727-15201	Broward	I-595/SR861	10/29/03	17.071 Miles

Bruce Dietrich was requested to further examine the pavement design of the above five(5) projects to ensure that they all fall within the requirements of the pilot project criteria. Turnpike resurfacing projects in 2003 will also be looked at for potential as pilots.

In order to implement task item (1), the CGAP Specification was reviewed by the group again and the following modifications were made:

- 1) Revise Section 338-4.2 in order to establish the threshold values and remedial work for mainline (Table 338-1) and non-mainline (Table 338-2) separately.

**TABLE 338-1**  
**MAINLINE**  
**CONDITION SURVEY**

Type of Distress	Type of Survey	Threshold Level for Each LOT (0.1 Mile) per lane	Remedial Work
Rutting	Any Survey	Depth > 0.30"	Remove and replace the distressed LOT(s) to the full distressed <del>depth</del> <b>layer(s)</b> and full lane width.
		Depth <= 0.30"	None required
Rideability	Any Survey	RN < 3.69	Remove and replace the distressed LOT(s) to the full distressed area(s) and full lane width
Cracking	Any Survey	Cracking >1/8" (Class 1B), accumulative cracking length > 50'	Remove and replace the distressed LOT(s) to the full distressed <del>depth</del> <b>layer(s)</b> and full lane width.

Type of Distress	Type of Survey	Threshold Level for Each LOT (0.1 Mile) per lane	Remedial Work
Raveling, delamination and other disintegrated areas affecting the friction course	Intermediate Survey	Underlying layer exposed, individual length > 10'	Remove and replace the distressed area(s) to the full distressed depth and full lane width or temporarily patch the distressed area(s).
	Final Survey	Underlying layer exposed, individual length < 10'	Patch the distressed area(s) and remove and replace the distressed area(s) to the full distressed depth and full lane width prior to the final survey.
Pot holes, slippage area(s), segregated area(s) and other disintegrated areas.	Any Survey	Observation by Engineer	Remove and replace the distressed area(s) to 150% of the area(s) or temporarily patch the distressed area(s) and remove and replace the distressed area(s) to 150% of the area(s) prior to the final survey.

**Remark:** (1) The Ride Number (RN) established by the laser profiler will express the ride quality of the pavement of a LOT being tested.

(2) For any two deficient LOTs not separated by 3 passing LOTs, the repair work shall cover the entire length of the deficient LOTs (including the passing LOTs).

(3) If the area of cracking, patching or raveling within a LOT exceeds 60 % of the LOT area, the total LOT shall be corrected by approved methods.

(4) The longitudinal construction joint at the lane line will not be considered as cracking during the survey.

(5) The rideability of the pavement shall be determined in accordance with the requirements of 330-13.6 (Acceptance Testing for Pavement Smoothness by Laser Profiler) and all deficiencies shall be corrected prior to the final acceptance of the project.

**TABLE 338-2  
NON-MAINLINE  
CONDITION SURVEY**

(Ramps, Auxiliary lanes, Acceleration Lane, Deceleration Lane, Shoulders, etc.)

Distress	Type of Survey	Threshold Level	Remedial Work
Rutting	High speed and/or manual measures	Design speed $\geq$ 50 mph , Depth = 0.30" Design speed < 50 mph Depth = 0.50"	Remove and replace distressed area to the depth of the distressed area
Rutting (ramps/shoulders)	Manual measures	Depth $\geq$ 0.50"	Same as above
Cracking	Any Survey	Crack width $\geq$ 0.25" and Crack length $\geq$ 10'	Same as above
Raveling, delamination disintegration (affecting surface	Any Survey	Same as Table 338-1	Same as Table 338-1

(affecting surface course)			
Pot holes, slippage, segregation	Any Survey	Same as Table 338-1	Same as Table 338-1
Bleeding	Any Survey	Losing surface texture in a 10' or greater length due to excess asphalt	Remove and replace distressed area to the depth of the distressed area

- 2) Modify and add some language in Section 338-4.2. (The revised CGAP Specifications is enclosed as Attachment 2).
- 3) Add some requirements in CPAM to state that the Engineer shall direct the Responsible Party to perform necessary remedial work immediately in accordance with the Specification requirements, if the rutting that will collect water on the pavement and will affect traffic safety.

After the completion of task item (1), the group used Table 338-2 as a basis to develop the Threshold Values and associated Remedial Work for the Materials and Workmanship Guaranteed Specifications as shown on Table X below:

TABLE X  
MATERIALS AND WORKMANSHIP (3 YEARS)  
CONDITION SURVEY

Distress	Type of Survey	Threshold Level	Remedial Work
Rutting	High speed and/or manual measures	Design speed $\geq 50$ mph Depth = 0.30" Design speed $< 50$ mph Depth = 0.50"	Remove and replace distressed area to the depth of the distressed area
Rutting (ramps/shoulders)	Manual measures	Depth $\geq 0.50$ "	Same as above
Cracking	Any Survey	Crack width $\geq 0.25$ " and Crack length $\geq 10'$	Same as above
Raveling, delamination, disintegration (affecting surface course)	Any Survey	Same as Table 338-1	Same as Table 338-1
Pot holes, slippage, segregation	Any Survey	Same as Table 338-1	Same as Table 338-1
Bleeding	Any Survey	Losing surface texture in a 10' or greater length due to excess asphalt	Remove and replace distressed area to the depth of the distressed area

Due to the time constraint, we decided to continue the discussion about task (2) and other items in our next meeting scheduled on November 26, 2002 (Tuesday), from 8:30 am to 4:00 pm at the State materials Research Park in Gainesville, Florida.